Doc. #316. Again, the Court denied Dunlap's Motion on the ground that the Bureau of Prisons has

the exclusive authority to address a prisoner's request for nunc pro tunc designation. Doc. #318.

24

25

26

¹ Refers to the Court's docket number.

1	The Court determined that Dunlap's second Motion was moot as the Bureau of Prisons had already
2	weighted the Court's recommendation, Dunlap's criminal history and California prison service
3	record, and decided not to grant Dunlap the retroactive nunc pro tunc designation. <i>Id</i> .
4	On May 7, 2014, Dunlap filed a third Motion for Reduction of Sentence Pursuant to 18
5	U.S.C. § 3585(b) and U.S.S.G. § 5G1.3(c). This Court has already recognized that the Bureau of
6	Prisons "has the exclusive authority to address a prisoner's request for nunc pro tunc designation
7	and that it rests within the discretion of [the Bureau of Prisons] to deny such a request." Doc. #318.
8	As the United States points out, neither 18 U.S.C. § 3585(b) nor U.S.S.G. § 5G1.3(c) undermine
9	the Bureau of Prisons' authority to do so. Accordingly, the Court shall deny Dunlap's third
10	successive request for retroactive nunc pro tunc designation.
11	
12	IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that Dunlap's Motion for Reduction of Sentence Pursuant
13	to 18 U.S.C. § 3585(b) and U.S.S.G. § 5G1.3(c) (Doc. #321) is DENIED.
14	IT IS SO ORDERED.
15	DATED this 20th day of August, 2014.
16	Sann
17	LAPRY R. HICKS UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	